

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

JH

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT¹⁰ JUN 2005

To:

VENNER, SHIPLEY & CO.
20 Little Britain
London EC1A 7DH
GRANDE BRETAGNE

RECEIVED

29 OCT 2004

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Rule 71.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

27.10.2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference
MCR43072PCT1

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

International application No.
PCT/GB 03/05453

International filing date (day/month/year)
15.12.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)
08.01.2003

Applicant

MONEY CONTROLS LIMITED et al.

1. The applicant is hereby notified that this International Preliminary Examining Authority transmits herewith the international preliminary examination report and its annexes, if any, established on the international application.
2. A copy of the report and its annexes, if any, is being transmitted to the International Bureau for communication to all the elected Offices.
3. Where required by any of the elected Offices, the International Bureau will prepare an English translation of the report (but not of any annexes) and will transmit such translation to those Offices.
4. **REMINDER**

The applicant must enter the national phase before each elected Office by performing certain acts (filing translations and paying national fees) within 30 months from the priority date (or later in some Offices) (Article 39(1)) (see also the reminder sent by the International Bureau with Form PCT/IB301).

Where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report. It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned.

For further details on the applicable time limits and requirements of the elected Offices, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

The applicant's attention is drawn to Article 33(5), which provides that the criteria of novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability described in Article 33(2) to (4) merely serve the purposes of international preliminary examination and that "any Contracting State may apply additional or different criteria for the purposes of deciding whether, in that State, the claimed inventions is patentable or not" (see also Article 27(5)). Such additional criteria may relate, for example, to exemptions from patentability, requirements for enabling disclosure, clarity and support for the claims.

Name and mailing address of the International preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523856 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Zeiselmair, S

Tel. +49 89 2399-2151





PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference MCR43072PCT1	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/PEA416)	
International application No. PCT/GB 03/05453	International filing date (day/month/year) 15.12.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 08.01.2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G07F3/00		
Applicant MONEY CONTROLS LIMITED et al.		
<p>1. This International preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of sheets.</p>		
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the opinion II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application 		
Date of submission of the demand 22.05.2004	Date of completion of this report 27.10.2004	
Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:  European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer Kernény, M Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7941 <div style="text-align: right;">  </div>	

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. **PCT/GB 03/05453**

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)*):

Description, Pages

1-14 as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-26 as originally filed

Drawings, Sheets

1/3-3/3 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
☐ the claims, Nos.:
☐ the drawings, sheets:

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. **PCT/GB 03/05453**

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3-13,16-26
	No: Claims	1-2,14-15
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-26
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET**

International application No. PCT/GB 03/05453

1 Summary

The application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, as claims 1, 2, 14 and 15 are not new within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT, and the other claims are not inventive within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

2 Prior Art

Reference may be made to the following documents:

- D1: EP-A-0 480 736 (MARS INC) 15 April 1992 (1992-04-15)
- D2: US-A-4 538 719 (GRAY MATTHEW H ET AL) 3 September 1985 (1985-09-03)
- D3: US-A-5 255 344 (HAYASHI ISAO ET AL) 19 October 1993 (1993-10-19)
- D4: BUCKLEY J J ET AL: "HYBRID NEURAL NETS CAN BE FUZZY CONTROLLERS AND FUZZY EXPERT E SYSTEMS" FUZZY SETS AND SYSTEMS, ELSEVIER SCIENCE PUBLISHERS, AMSTERDAM, NL, vol. 60, no. 2, 10 December 1993 (1993-12-10), pages 135-142; XP000405982 ISSN: 0165-0114
- D5: US 2001/009485 A1 (FURUYA YONEZO) 26 July 2001 (2001-07-26)
- D6: US-A-5 355 989 (BEST JOCHEN) 18 October 1994 (1994-10-18)

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability

3 Novelty

3.1 Independent Claim 1

Document D1 discloses:

- 1) A method of accepting of money items ("A method of operating a money validation apparatus", claim 1), comprising
- 2) generating individual money items signals with a value that is a function of the respective items of money under test (implicit, as the output of any (e.g. magnetic) sensing means is a (e.g. electrical) signal, which therefore has been transformed);
- 3) developing for each of the money items under test, a transformed money item

- signal as a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of an acceptability criterion for the money item under test ("converting the sensed data into a plurality of data points", claim 1);
- 4) making a comparison of the values of the transformed money item signals with a window limit value ("comparing the data point of the item to the cluster", claim 1); and
 - 5) accepting each money item in dependence upon said comparison ("accepting the item of the first type if its data point matches one of the data points within the cluster", claim 1).

Therefore, all features of claim 1 are known from D1, the claim being not new within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT. The requirement of Article 33(1) PCT are not met.

3.2 Dependent Claim 2

Claim 1 of document D1 discloses:

- 1) the reading of the characteristics of genuine money items and storing the data, thus learning what the "proper" characteristics are, and then
- 2) testing money items to be tested by comparing the sensed characteristics of the items to be tested to the data previously stored.

This is the additional subject-matter of claim 2 of the present application, which therefore is considered not new, either.

3.3 Independent Claim 14 and Dependent Claim 15

The same reasoning as under points 3.1 and 3.2 applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claim 14 and dependent claim 15, which therefore are also considered not new.

4 Inventive Step

4.1 Dependent Claims 3 and 16

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET**

International application No. PCT/GB 03/05453

The difference between claim 3 and D1, which is considered to be the closest prior art, is that the decision making system is a rule based expert system.

The plausible technical problem for the person skilled in the art to be solved is how to implement the transformation of the signal.

Documents D3 and D4 describe rules based expert systems. Both documents were published almost 10 years before the priority date of the present application. Therefore, their contents are part of the knowledge of the person skilled in the art of implementing a decision making system. Implementing a rule based expert system is a normal thing a person skilled in the art of implementing decision making systems, in particular since the advantages of such a rules based expert system can be clearly overseen in advance.

Therefore, the person skilled in the art would implement a rules based expert system for the above plausible technical problem. As a consequence, both claims 3 and 16 do not comprise an inventive step within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT, due to which the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT are not met.

4.2 Other Dependent Claims

The features of the other dependent claims, insofar as they are not known from the documents cited in the Search Report for the same purpose as in the present application, are generally known to a person skilled in the art, and therefore, do not produce an inventive step.